

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To: MICHAEL J. MALLIE
BLAKELY, SOROLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year)

21 MAR 2003

Applicant's or agent's file reference

42590.P14868XPCT

REPLY DUE

within **TWO** months
from the above date of mailing

International application No

PCT/US02/07670

International filing date (day/month/year)

15 MARCH 2002

Priority date (day/month/year)

16 MARCH 2001

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC(7) H01S 3/10, 3/08 and US Cl. 372/40, 92

Applicant

NEW FOCUS, INC

1 This written opinion is the first (first, etc) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority

2 This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

I ☒ Basis of the opinion

II ☐ Priority

III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability

IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention

V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement

VI ☐ Certain documents cited

VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application

VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3 The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3 For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.5 and 66.9

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion

4 The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is 16 JULY 2003

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile No (703) 305-5250

Authorized officer

ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ

Telephone No (703) 305-6218

Form PCT/IPEA/406 (cover sheet) (July 1998)*

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US02/07672

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

☒ the international application as originally filed

☒ the description

pages 1-34

pages NONE, as originally filed

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of

☒ the claims

pages 35-41

pages NONE, as originally filed

pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of

☒ the drawings

pages 1-20

pages NONE, as originally filed

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of

☒ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages NONE

pages NONE, as originally filed

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23 1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of

☒ the description, pages NONE

☒ the claims, Nos NONE

☒ the drawings, sheets/figs NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made: since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70 2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed".

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No

PCT/US92/07672

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. statement

Novelty (N)

Claims NONE

YES

Claims 1-54

NO

Inventive Step (IS)

Claims NONE

YES

Claims 1-54

NO

Industrial Applicability (IA)

Claims 1-54

YES

Claims NONE

NO

2. citations and explanations

Claims 1-8, 10, 13-15, 19-25, 27, 30-32, 36-37, 49-54 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Terada et al (5,214,659). As illustrated in figure 4, angles of inclination of the two wavelength selection elements (5) and (4) arranged on an optical path of a laser beam source are varied to make a laser output variable. Light transmitting ranges of the two wavelength selection elements are coincided with each other so as to adjust the light wavelength bands, thereby the laser beam is narrowed without increasing its fineness.

Claims 9, 11, 12, 16-18, 26, 28, 29, 33-35 and 48 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Terada. As shown in figure 4 inclinations angles of the fine adjusting etalon 8 and the rough adjusting etalon 4 can be varied by the actuators 12a and 12b, respectively. Terada teaches adjustment of the etalons to obtain the a variable laser output, where the techniques of thermo and electrical adjustment would be obvious design preference since such techniques are well-known in the art.

Claims 1-54 meet the criteria for industrial applicability set out in PCT Article 33(4), because the claimed subject matter is useful in the electrical industry.

ANY RESPONSE MAY BE FAXED TO
OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL PROGRAMS EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800
(703) 305-0843

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 5,214,659 (TERADA et al) 25 May 1993 (25.05.1993), entire document

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No

PCT/US02/07672

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.